## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated February 1, 2007. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

## **Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the element originally defined in claim 2. In light of the amendments to claim 1, claims 2 and 3 have been amended to align with the new definition of the invention provided by claim 1.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

## Claims - 35 USC§103

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,672,699 to Jeong in view of US Publication 2002/0140758 to Watrobski et al.

Amended claim 1 is restricted to printer upgrades that involve replacing the starter cartridge with a cartridge that operates at a higher speed. Neither of the cited references disclose a printer that can be upgraded to print more quickly by installing a cartridge that can operate at a higher speeds. Likewise, there is no disclosure of a print engine controller that can change the speed at which it controls a printhead.

The citations fail to teach or suggest all the elements of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Jeong and Watrobski fail to support a §103 rejection.

Claim 3 stands rejected as obvious in light of Jeong and Watrobski, in view of US 6,033,053 to Eun. The Eun disclosure does not teach a printer controller that identifies the print speed capabilities of a cartridge and transmit its control signal accordingly. Therefore, the combined disclosures of Jeong, Watrobski and Eun fails to disclose all the elements of amended claim 1 and hence dependent claim 3.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected as obvious in light of Jeong and Watrobski, in view of US 6,851,799 to Trafton et al and in view of US6,238,115 to Silverbrook, respectively.

As discussed above, Jeong and Watrobski do not anticipate amended claims 1 or 2. Accordingly, the combined disclosures of Jeong and Watrobski and each of the additional references fail to support a §103 rejection of dependent claims 4 and 5.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable

reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Response to Final Office Action of February 1, 2007

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

ans

Kia Silverbrook

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762